DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 752 HE 016 732

AUTHOR Colley, Sanford
TITLE Education of the Whole Person: A New Look at an Old Priority.
PUB DATE 3 Oct 83
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented to the University of Montevallo Freshman Seminar Program, (Montevallo, AL, October 3, 1978).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Objectives; College Curriculum; *College Role; Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; Emotional Development; Higher Education; Humanistic Education; Human Relations; Interpersonal Competence; Research Methodology; *Student Development; *Values Education

ABSTRACT

The education of the whole person and the noncognitive dimensions of curriculum and teaching methodology are considered. Attention is also directed to the methods of scholarly research that may be employed in investigating this area of learning. Terms that have been used to describe affective development or a combined approach to cognitive and affective learning are identified (e.g., humanistic education, developmental education). It is noted that affective education is concerned with both intrapersonal and interpersonal development. The following research approaches that would be employed by social scientists in exploring education for the whole person are described: historical research, descriptive research, and experimental research. Conclusions include the following: the efficacy of values clarification exercises and programs of human development are not consistently supported by empirical research; this lack of support may reflect the inadequacy of using empirical research techniques to assess affective learning; and public schools and teacher education programs should provided experiences to develop interpersonal and human relations skills. Affective learning at University of Montevallo is also briefly addressed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sanford Colley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED235752

HE016732

EDUCATION OF THE WHOLE PERSON
A New Look At An Old Priority

by Sanford Colley

Lecture prepared for the University of Montevallo Freshman Seminar Program, October 3, 1978.

Let me begin by sharing with you some of my personal feelings on this occasion. First, while it would not be particularly original to say that it is a privilege to participate in this series of lectures, honesty demands that I make such an acknowledgement. It is a singular honor, and I am deeply appreciative of having been selected to represent the College of Education in this Freshman Seminar Program.

Second, let me express my wholehearted personal commitment to this kind of academic effort. It concerns me greatly that, whether because of organizational structure or curriculum, institutions of higher education often inadvertently contribute to the fragmentation of knowledge. I fully support efforts such as this to involve faculty and students in the pursuit of knowledge across disciplinary lines.

Finally, I must confess experiencing a keen sense of responsibility as I prepared tonight's lecture. Most of us on the faculty have attended professional meetings and presented so called "scholarly" papers to colleagues within our own disciplines. But, somehow, preparing this paper for students and faculty from other diciplines has been infinitely more challenging -- and at times even intimidating.

The charge we were given in preparing these lectures was to:

I. address a topic of current interest in our disciplines,

II. demonstrate how scholars approach those problems, and

III. show how those methods relate to courses taught at the University of Montevallo.

Those three points will provide the outline for this lecture.

I.

The topic I would like to address tonight is an old concern in the educational enterprise, the education of the whole person. Although it is a topic I have a personal interest in, and discuss regularly in my teaching, it had been some time since I had thoroughly reviewed the related literature. In preparing this paper, I was frankly surprised at the volume of material published recently of which I was completely unaware. The experience reminded me again of the importance of what Wilkening (1978) called the key to good teaching, and that is the continuous researching, rechecking, and amplifying of material for use in the classroom. The experience also gave me a new appreciation of a limerick I learned long ago:

> There was a young man named Messer
> Whose knowledge grew lesser and lesser
> Until one fall
> He had no knowledge at all
> So he became a college professor.

Like so many things we find amusing, that limerick has in it a bud of truth. Any thinking person surveying the explosion of knowledge in a given area cannot help but feel that his or her own knowledge has grown "lesser and lesser." My only hope is that at the end of this lecture, you will not conclude that I have reached the point of having "no knowledge at all!"

A commitment to the education of the whole person is a commitment to learning which goes beyond the three R's. Even a cursory survey of the literature reveals an abundance of such terms as humanistic education, affective education, values clarification, moral education, confluent education, psychological education, experiential learning, and human relations training, all of which purport to deal with learnings which go beyond the purely cognitive or intellectual.

In spite of this flurry of interest, however, I think it's important that we take a critical look at what's involved in the non-cognitive dimensions of curriculum and teaching methodology. In their enthusiastic response to affective education, some proponents have, unfortunately, resembled Stephen Leacock's mythical character who "flung himself from the room, flung himself on his horse, and rode off in all directions." It seems to me that what we need to keep us from riding off in all directions is a careful consideration of the answers to some of the basic questions concerning the education of the whole person. Scholarly research in education provides a vehicle for just such an analysis. It generates data which enables us to both answer questions, as well as to question some popular answers.

Before describing the methods of scholarly research and taking a critical look at the issue of educating the whole person, let me attempt to briefly delineate the kinds of learning involved in such an approach to education.

I occasionally ask my students in educational psychology to try to recall some of their earliest learnings, which I record on the chalkboard in one of three categories. In one category are those

learnings which are primarily intellectual in nature -- psychologists use the designation "cognitive" learnings: "I learned to count," "I learned to spell my name," "I learned the alphabet," and so on. Those learnings are easy to identify and the list could be endless. There is a second category of learnings which are primarily physical or behavioral -- psychologists use the term "psychomotor:" "I learned to tie my shoes," "I learned to dress myself," "I learned to ride my tricycle." Again, these learnings are easy to identify. Then, there are always some learnings which do not fit neatly into one of those two categories: "I learned I should tell the truth," "I learned I can get my way by crying," "I learned it made me feel bad when somebody called me names." While this third category of learnings are somewhat more complex and more difficult to identify, psychologists have suggested that what they have in common is a <u>feeling</u> or attitudinal component. Hence they are referred to as <u>affective</u> learnings.

If we accept the education of the whole person as a priority in education, then we must concern ourselves with all three types of learnings: cognitive, psychomotor, and affective. Traditionally, educators have been primarily concerned with cognitive learnings. Lately, however, there has been increasing attention given to psychomotor learnings, as well as to affective learnings. It is in this third area that I would like to focus my remarks.

Unfortunately, there are a number of terms which are used interchangeably in the professional literature, all of which refer to some aspect of affective learning. We need to examine the ways those terms have been used and from that usage suggest at least working definitions.

First, there are a group of terms which describe a broadly based philosophy of education stressing the facilitation of both cognitive and affective development. The most commonly used of these terms is humanistic education (Patterson, 1973; Read & Simon, 1975; Simpson & Gray, 1976; Valett, 1977; Weinstein & Fantini, 1970; Weller, 1977; Zahorik & Brubaker, 1972). Probably the most descriptive of these terms, however, is confluent education (Brown, 1971), suggesting a confluence of the cognitive and affective domains. Another term which is functionally synonymous with confluent education and humanistic education is process education (Borton, 1970).

Within that philosophical framework, teaching for affective development has been referred to as affective education (Castillo, 1974), psychological education (Ivy & Alschuler, 1973), integrative education (Abruscato, 1969), developmental education (Gazda, 1975), and emotional education (Ellis, 1969). Probably the most common term to be used is affective education.

Within affective education, the goals vary, but the following seem to be most common. First, there is a concern for Intrapersonal Development, including awareness development, values clarification, the development of a self-concept, moral reasoning, and the development of a sense of responsibleness. Second, there is a concern for Interpersonal Development, or effectiveness in human relations, including the acquisition of listening skills, communication skills, helping skills, and assertiveness skills. I would like to suggest as a working definition for affective education any program or technique designed to facilitate those goals.

II.

What I propose to do now is to take a new look at this old priority in the educational enterprise -- the education of the whole person -- and demonstrate how scholars from my discipline have and could study that topic using three categories or types of research methodology:

A. The Historical study which attempts to determine "what was,"
B. The Descriptive study which attempts to determine "what is," and
C. The Experimental study which attempts to determine "what may be."

(Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1972, p. 26)

Before looking at these three methodologies in educational research, I should emphasize that a major problem of researchers in the social sciences is the inherent complexity of the subject matter we deal with. Whereas the natural scientist is usually studying a limited number of variables which can be precisely measured, the social scientist is dealing with a complex array of variables, many of which he or she cannot control, and most of which are extremely difficult to measure.

A. Historical Research

The purpose of historical research is to arrive at conclusions concerning past events, including the historical development of ideas, concepts, and theory. While what follows is not strictly speaking an example of historical research, I would like to briefly trace the evolvement of the educational goal to educate the whole person, give a specific example of historic research in this area, and then suggest how we might conduct a type of historical research here at Montevallo.

The view that education should involve the whole person is as

ancient as Greek philosophy. Although the mind was supreme in Plato's system, education was directed to the development of the whole man, body and soul, sense and reason, character and mind (Schlosser, 1976). Even the Greeks, however, debated the issue. The observation of Aristotle in Politics has a distinctively contemporary ring to it:

> At present, opinion is divided about the subjects of education. People do not all take the same position about what should be learned by the young, either with a view to excellence or with a view to the best life; nor is it clear whether their studies should be mainly directed to the intellect or to moral character."
>
> (Patterson, 1973, p.1)

Then, during the fifteenth century the Renaissance Humanists articulated the goal of education as being the "formation of a complete man through the study of the classics," (Schlosser, 1976, p. 28). While humanism and humanistic are terms which have been used in different ways among the various disciplines, the current interest in the education of the whole person -- usually referred to as "humanistic education" -- has a clear precursor in classical humanism and, subsequently, in the humanities.

The eighteenth century philosopher, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, has been described as one who traveled all over Europe, unable to decide upon one wife, one religion, or one job (Educational Psychology, 1973). However, he had one very definite idea about the way children should be educated, and his writings have had a lasting impact on educational thought. He had a very optimistic view of man and suggested that children were born with a natural tendency toward growth and goodness. That view, which he describes in Emile, was a clear departure from the

religious dogma of the day, but a philosophical precursor to the Humanistic philosophy of education described earlier.

Even a brief overview of the history of American education reveals that schools and colleges in this country have always been concerned with more than just intellectual development. The seventeenth century colonial schools, for example, stressed moral education, usually in the form of religious instruction. This approach was based on the belief that orthodoxy in religion was an essential condition of individual morality (Thayer, 1968). Concern over the separation of church and state during the eighteenth century shifted moral education away from religious instruction, even though moral development remained a major concern of elementary schools as well as the new secondary schools called academies. By the ninteenth century the separation of moral education from religious instruction had been fairly well established. William T. Harris wrote in an 1871 tract entitled Morality in the Schools:

> Morality involves behavior toward others and behavior towards one's self . . . . The whole of this behavior can be taught, and is taught best, without bringing it into the same place and time with religious instruction.
> (Thayer, 1968, p. 178)

Horace Mann, the father of the common schools, believed that one of the most important dimensions of education should be character training or moral education (Educational Psychology, 1973). Psychologist G. Stanley Hall took the position that "effective teaching requires the matching of subject matter with ways of thinking, feeling and acting . . . in the life of the individual (Thayer, 1968, pp. 194-5)." Finally, the

McGuffey Readers, which were first published in 1836 and used by four generations of Americans, were very much concerned with moral education. They warned against "disobedience to authority" as well as the "evils of lying, cheating, idleness, and drink" and stressed the virtues of "promptness, goodness, honesty, and thrift (Educational Psychology, 1973, p. 8)."

Not until the twentieth century, however, did the broader approach to education, which came to be called progressivism, reach its zenith. Spokesman for the movement, John Dewey, and his popularizer, William H. Kilpatrick, suggested that teachers should pay more attention to the individual child, that children would learn best material which had some meaning to them, and that education should develop the whole child. Provided the right kind of educational environment, the progressive educators believed, the child would develop physically, socially, emotionally, and mentally (Weller, 1977).

In higher education as well, there was a new concern over the so-called "integration" of the curriculum for the purpose of producing the well-rounded student. Colgate University popularized the new survey courses to insure a well-rounded education, and Stephens College developed a curriculum around "functional areas of living (Thayer, 1968, p. 227)."

The prevailing philosophy of education during this time was summed up by the National Education Association in a volume entitled The Purposes of Education in American Democracy: "The general end of education in America at the present time," they asserted, "is the fullest possible development of the individual within the framework of our

present industrialized society (Thayer, 1968, p. 301)."

By the forties, the popularity of progressivism began to wane. Ironically, its phenomenal growth may have contributed to its downfall. Some advocates distorted the child-centered emphasis to mean almost total permissiveness, with the result that their classrooms were chaotic, the rights of some childern were ignored, property was destroyed, and students were frustrated. But perhaps the most serious drawback of the movement was that, while the progressivists had very definite ideas about what they opposed, they only had a vague idea of what it was they hoped to accomplish. They were like Alice in Wonderland who asked the Cheshire Cat:

> "Which way I ought to go from here?" "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to," said the Cat. "I don't much care where --" said Alice. "Then it doesn't matter which way you go," said the Cat.
> (Carroll, 1973, p. 87)

Progressivists were not sure where they wanted to go because theories and models of learning in the affective domain were simply non-existant (Morris, 1978). Goals like "character" and "citizenship" were too general to be of use as educational objectives and too vague to be objectively evaluated. Consequently, suggests Chase (1975), they were relegated to "the other side of the report card (p. 2)."

During this period, progressive education was blamed for the decline of academic standards and the entire educational enterprise began to be criticized. Works began to be published like Bestor's (1953) Education Wastelands, Keats' (1958) Schools Without Scholars, Latimer's (1958) What's Happened to Our Schools?, and Koerner's (1963)

The Miseducation of American Teachers. For some, the concern approached paranoia; the National Council for American Education published phamphlets entitled Education Increases Delinquency and How Bad Are the Schools (Thayer, 1968)? Two critics, in particular, offered articulate and scathing criticisms. One was Walter Lippmann who, speaking before the Phi Beta Kappa society in 1941, gave his address a title which I have to view as something of an overstatement. It was entitled "Education vs. Civilization (Thayer, 1968, p. 843)!" The other critic was Admiral Hyman G. Rickover (1963) who, after publishing two earlier works critical of education and gaining national attention during Congressional Hearings in 1959, published a work entitled American Education -- A National Failure.

An event which created fertile ground for all these criticisms was the 1957 launching of Sputnik by Russia. There was widespread concern that we were falling behind in our technological race with Russia. Responding to that concern, Congress passed in 1958 the National Defense Education Act which provided substantial funds for renewed academic efforts, particularly in math and science.

It has now been two decades since NDEA. During that time we have seen first a decline and then a revival of interest in the affective dimensions of education. Unlike the era of progressivism, however, much of the new movement in humanistic education is based on models of learning which have received rigorous scrutiny and study. Let me illustrate how historical research was utilized in the development of one of these models.

A landmark effort in systematically organizing learning objectives

was the work entitled Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, in which learnings were grouped in the three domains discussed earlier: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain was published in 1956 (Bloom, 1956) and Handbook II: Affective Domain, was published in 1964 (Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964). In their research for the volume on affective objectives, the authors did what could be called a historical study. They examined catalog descriptions of college courses and frequently found in the initial description as much emphasis given to affective objectives as to cognitive objectives. Over a period of ten to twenty years, however, they typically found an erosion of affective objectives and a tendency to describe the objectives in terms of cognitive learnings which were easily taught and easily evaluated (Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964).

I have provided the Seminar Leaders with the objectives which have appeared in the Alabama College and University of Montevallo Catalogs for the last twenty years. You might find it interesting to discuss the extent to which those objectives describe affective outcomes, and try to ascertain whether there has been a significant change in the stated objectives of this institution with respect to affective outcomes.

B. Descriptive Research

The second type of research methodology employed by scholars in education is the descriptive study, which attempts to determine "what is" and frequently establishes the existence of a relationship between two or more variables.

An example of descriptive research is reported by Aspy and Roebuck (1972) and deals with the area of affective education we identified earlier as interpersonal development. These researchers investigated the relationship between three dimensions of interpersonal relationships which Rogers (1961) had suggested were characteristic of effective teachers - empathy, congruence, and positive regard - and the cognitive growth of third grade students. Using a standardized scale for rating the dimensions, experienced raters listened to audio tapes of the classroom teaching of the teachers and the subsequent ratings were compared to student gains on a standardized achievement test across one academic year. The results were impressive. There was a clear positive correlation between the three conditions and cognitive growth. Students of teachers who provided high levels of the dimensions experienced high levels of cognitive growth, and students of teachers who provided low levels of the dimensions experienced low levels of cognitive growth.

I might add that other studies have established a clear relationship between one or more of these conditions and a number of variables which concern the educator. High levels of the conditions are positively related to levels of interest (Reed, 1962), student achievement (Christensen, 1960), I.Q. scores (Aspy, 1972), and self-concept (Aspy, 1972). Further, they are inversely related to absenteeism (Aspy and Roebuck, 1974).

One of the problems in descriptive studies, where the researcher does not control all the variables, is that the findings can be misleading. Sometimes a clear correlation exists between two variables:

that is, as one variable increases, the other increases, and as one variable decreases the other decreases. When that situation exists, we say the two variables are positively correlated. Even when a clear correlation exists, however, the researcher cannot conclude that a causative relationship exists. Let me give an example. There is a positive correlation between the consumption of ice cream, and the incidence of sex crimes. Every time ice cream sales go up, sex crimes go up, and every time ice cream sales go down, sex crimes go down. Now, what can we conclude from having established this correlation? It is tempting to conclude that changes in variable A are causing the changes in variable B; eating ice cream causes sex crimes. But, we could just as easily conclude that variable B is causing A; commiting sex crimes creates a craving for ice cream! Or, since the researcher has not controlled all the variables, both A and B might be influenced by an unconsidered variable C, in this case warmer weather. Both ice cream and sex crimes increase in summer and decrease in winter. Correlation demonstrates that a functional relationship exists between two variables, but it does not prove causation.

In the scientific study of humans, of course, there are ethical standards which preclude certain kinds of experimental research, where the investigator has greater control over the variables. The effects of smoking on prenatal development is just one example. While researchers would never do an experimental study in this area, there are ample ex post facto, Latin meaning "from after the fact," studies demonstrating a clear positive correlation between heavy smoking by expectant

mothers and numerous other undesirable variables, such as premature birth, lower birth weight, spontaneous abortions, and even still-births and neonatal death (Annis, 1978).

C. Experimental Research

The final type of research study we want to examine is the experimental study, which attempts to establish causation. Since it enables us to predict "what will be," it is generally viewed as the most sophisticated of the research methodologies. Experimental studies involve the manipulation or control of one variable, called the independent variable, to see if there is any effect on another variable, called the dependent variable. The basic assumption is that if two situations are completely identical, and if only one variable is manipulated, then whatever change we observe in that situation can be attributed to that one variable (Ary, Jacobs, & Razarieh, 1972).

For the purposes of identifying some issues in experimental research, let me relate the background and development of one experimental study which failed to support the efficacy of a particular approach to affective education. During recent years, a number of commercial programs in affective education have been developed, among them the American Guidance Services' DUSO program (Dinkmeyer, 1970), the Science Research Associates' Self-Development Program (Anderson, Lang, & Scott, 1970), and the Human Development Training Institute's Human Development Program (Bessell & Palomares, 1970), commonly referred to as the "magic circle" program. Although the subjective reports of teachers using programs such as these are generally favorable, (Bessell & Palomares,

1970; Dinkmeyer, 1973; Morgan, 1971), there has been a dearth of objective research yielding empirical data in support of these programs. The "magic circle" program has been particularly popular, and a number of experimental studies have attempted to evaluate its effectiveness. Montgomery (1971) employed the awareness portion of the program and found that, of the sixteen variables he was studying, students showed significant improvement on only two. McGee (1972) used the program with preschoolers and found a significant increase in I. Q. scores, but not in personal or social adjustment. Then, Sweaney (1973) used the program with first graders in Tuscaloosa schools and found, in spite of overwhelmingly positive subjective reactions from students and teachers, no significant difference between the experimental and control groups on the affective variables.

III.

What have we learned from this research? What will be the outcome of this flurry of interest in affective education? Some have suggested that it is just another fad, like so many others in education, which struts and frets its hour upon the stage and then is heard no more.

With the various dimensions of intrapersonal development, there are still many unanswered questions. Values clarification exercises and programs of human development are currently popular with teachers, but the empirical data from research studies with these exercises do not consistently support their efficacy. Those programs and techniques obviously need a lot of further study, but it seems to me that we should

remain open in our final evaluation of them. We cannot ignore the frequent discrepancy between the overwhelmingly positive subjective reports from researchers and the somewhat tenuous empirical data generated in those studies. That discrepancy may reflect the ineffectiveness of affective education, or it may reflect the inadequacy of research techniques with affective learnings. The possibility of that inadequacy poses a dilema for us. We have tended to develop only those educational programs which can be demonstrated to be effective in terms of empirical data. By doing this, however, we are running the risk of developing programs which limit, and quite possibly distort the potentials of students. Nevitt Sanford (1970) warned that researchers may be discovering truths about a researchable model of man -- fashioned according to research needs -- rather than man himself.

What is obviously needed is a careful consideration of the methodological problems involved in the study of affective outcomes, the limitations of traditional research designs, and the possibilities of new designs and evaluative instruments. Until scholars in education become more sophisticated in our understanding of affective learning, it may be that we need to heed the admonition of Bertrand Russell to live without certainty and yet not be paralyzed by hesitation.

Such a tentative stance is not necessary with the various dimensions of interpersonal functioning and human relations training. In these areas the research has been voluminous, conducted with a wide range of both student and teacher populations, and consistently favorable. It seems to me desirable that public school provide experiences to develop such skills in students, and imperative that teacher education programs begin to include human relations training in their curricula, as we are

now beginning to do here at Montevallo. Thre is a clear need for such training. We have a solid theoretical model to meet that need. And we have the research to support that model. Little wonder that a frustrated David Aspy (1975) entitled an article in The Counseling Psychologist, "Empathy, Let's Get the Hell On With It."

What about here at Montevallo? To what extent are we concerned with affective learnings? For several years prior to the current catalog, the statement of objectives concluded with the sentence:

> The program at Montevallo should enable each graduate to be an active citizen in his community with an attitude toward improving his own life and of help other people. (University of Montevallo Bulletin, 1976-77, p. 16)

I would be hard pressed to come up with a more succinct statement of the goals of affective education than that!

More recently, the Preliminary Report of the Missions and Goals Commission affirms the University's continued commitment to "the intellectual and personal growth of the individual." The report goes on to describe that growth in terms of "responsible, informed citizenship" and speaks of graduates being able to "assess and measure values (The Next Decade: A Focus on Quality, 1978)."

Many courses we offer deal with affective outcomes, particularly in the College of Fine Arts. Even in that area, however, a comparison of our present catalog with the catalog of thirty years ago confirms what Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964) found. Whereas our current catalog mentions few affective learnings in course titles, the Alabama College Bulletin of 1948-49 describes such courses as:

Art 310 - Art Appreciation

Art 321 - History and Appreciation of Ancient Art

Art 322 - History and Appreciation of Medieval Art

Art 361 - History and Appreciation of Renaissance Art

Art 362 - History and Appreciation of Modern Art

Music 351,352 - Appreciation

Music 451,452 - Appreciation, Aesthetics

Furthermore, History 101-102 included a one hour interdisciplinary topic, "History and Appreciation of Music." Now, I am not suggesting that those courses were superior to the courses we offer today. What I suspect is that we have gradually dropped those affective descriptives from course titles, not because we view them as unimportant but because we have given up trying to measure such outcomes. My own bias is that they are important and that, as educators, we need to devote more attention to how they might be more precisely defined and more objectively evaluated. Fortunately, we are beginning to develop a body of literature in this area (see the annotated bibliography in Simpson & Gray, 1976, pp. 302-307).

Although we do not normally think of the sciences as being concerned with affective learnings, Alvin Toffler's (1970) Future Shock has sensitized us to the ethical and moral issues involved in our accelerating knowledge explosion, and I have read of several pilot projects where a consideration of such issues has been built into science courses.

Finally, there is a very real sense in which the transmission of

any so-called "factual" knowledge involves a personal, affective component. While a consideration of the nature of knowledge is beyond the scope of this lecture, I found myself in complete agreement with an essay by Walker Gibson (1978), past president of the National Council of Teachers of English. He suggests that the back to basics movement has ignored a very basic truth, and that is "the human nature of knowledge," When we see or hear statements such as "History will show . . ." or "Science proves . . .," Gibson suggests, we need to immediately ask, "Who's History?" or "Whose science (p. 48)?"

Ultimately, of course, the question of where affective education is going will be answered by those of us in education who are committed to the concept of developing the whole person. It will be up to faculty who try to educate students who are thoughtful and knowledgeable, but who are also sensitive, creative, emotionally alive, and morally responsible. It will be up to teacher educators who train teachers in the fine art of developing the intellectual resources of students, but who are also effective in interpersonal relations; teachers who can communicate respect and warmth, who can understand empathically, who are genuine and real, who share of themselves as persons, who are comfortable in the immediacy of a relationship, and who can effectively confront when necessary. And, it will be up to elementary and secondary teachers, who provide students with learning experiences which insure that they will develop as total persons.

Finally, in a very real sense, the ultimate worth of affective education will be up to those of you who are students. For if we can pro-

vide you with an educational experience which not only causes you to become more knowledgable and develops your capacity to think, but also enables you to relate to your fellow man, to appreciate the beauty created by man and nature, and to define and clarify your values, then education will have provided you with the raw materials for living what the current University of Montevallo Bulletin (1978-79) calls "productive and satisfying lives." But education can do no more that that. The rest is up to you.

REFERENCES

Abruscato, Integrative Education. Education, 1969, 89, 353-358.

Alabama College Bulletin, Catalog Issue, 1948-49.

Anderson, J.; Lang. C.; & Scott, V. Focus On Self-Development Program: Stage 1 - Awareness, Grades K-2. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1970.

Annis, L. F. The Child Before Birth. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Ary, D.N.; Jacobs, L.C.; & Razavieh, A. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1972.

Aspy, D. N. Reaction to Carkhuff's Articles. Counseling Psychologist, 3 (3), 35-41.

Aspy, D. N.; & Roebuck, F. N. An Investigation of the Relationship Between Levels of Cognitive Functioning and the Teacher's Classroom Behavior. Journal of Educational Research, May, 1972.

Aspy, D. N. Empathy, Let's Get the Hell On With It. The Counseling Psychologist, 1975, 5 (2), 10-14.

Bessell, H. & Palomares, U. Methods in Human Development Theory Manual. San Diego: Human Development Training Institute, 1970.

Bestor, A. Educational Wastelands: The Retreat From Learning in Our Schools. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1953.

Bloom, B. S., Ed. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1956.

Borton, T. Reach, Touch, and Teach: Student Concerns and Process Education. New York: McGraw - Hill, 1970.

Brown, G. Human Teaching for Human Learning. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Carroll, L. Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1973.

Castillo, G. A. Left-Handed Teaching: Lessons in Affective Education. New York: Draeger, 1974.

Chase, L. The Other Side of the Report Card: A How-to-do-it Program for Affective Education. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.

Christensen, C. M. Relationships Between Pupil Achievement, Pupil Affect - need, Teacher warmth and Teacher Permissiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51 (3), 169-174.

Dinkmeyer, D., Ed. AGS Duso Program. Circle Pines, Minn.: American Guidance Services, Inc., 1970.

Dinkmeyer, D. Facilitating Communications: A Mutual Concern of Counselors and Teachers. Texas Personnel and Guidance Association Journal, 1973, 2 (1), 4-11.

Educational Psychology: A Contemporary View. Del Mar, Calif.: CRM Books, 1973.

Ellis, A. An Experiment in Emotional Education. Educational Technology, 1971, 11, 61-64.

Gazda, G. Developmental Education: Its Application to Teacher and Counselor Education. The Alabama Personnel and Guidance Association Quarterly, 1975, 12 (2), 10-13.

Gibson, W. The Knowledge of Human Minds. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1978, 16 (8), 48.

Ivy, A. E.; & Alschuler, A. S. Psychological Education is . . . . Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1973, 51 (9), 588-589.

Keats, P. Schools Without Scholars. Boston: Houghton Alifflin Co., 1958.

Koerner, J. D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.

Krathwohl, D. R.; Bloom, B. S.; & Masia, B. B. Taxonomy of Educational objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964.

Latimer, J. F. What's Happened to Our Schools? Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1958.

McGee, G. A. An Evaluation of the Effects of the Bessell-Palomares Human Development Program on five year olds in an Appalachian Head Start Program. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 4329 A.

Montgomery, J. L. The Effects of Awareness Training in a Modified Encounter Group on Selected Aspects of Personality With Kindergarten Children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 5773 A.

Morgan, H. Developing and Demonstrating A Curriculum of Affective Education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 98 A.

Patterson, C. H. Humanistic Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice - Hall, Inc., 1973.

Read, D. A.; & Simon, S. B.; Eds. Humanistic Education Sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice - Hall, Inc., 1975.

Reed, H. B. Implications for Science Education Of a Teacher Competence Research. Science Education, 1962, 473-486.

Rickover, H. G. American Education - A National Failure. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1963.

Royers, C. R. On Becoming A Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Sanford, N. Issues in Personality Theory. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Schlosser, C. D. The Person in Education: A Humanistic Approach. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.

Simpson, E. L.; & Gray, M.A. Humanistic Education: An Interpretation. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976.

Sweaney, D. R. A Study of the Effects of an Affective Curriculum Program on the Awareness, Self-Concept, and Social Interaction of First Grade Students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 6394 A.

Thayer, V. T. Formative Ideas in American Education. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co., 1968.

The Next Decade: A Focus on Quality. Preliminary Report of The Mission and Goals Commission on the Future of the University of Montevallo, 1978.

Toffler, A. Future Shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

University of Montevallo Bulletin, Catalog Issue, 1977-78.

University of Montevallo Bulletin, 1978-79.

Valett, R. E. Humanistic Education: Developing The Total Person. St. Louis: The C. V. Mosby Co., 1977.

Weinstein, G. & Fautini, M.D., Eds. Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect. New York: Praeyer, 1970.

Weller, R. H., Ed. Humanistic Education: Visions and Realities. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

Wilkening, W. H. Research, Publishing, and Teaching: A Continuing Academic Dilemma. University College Quarterly.

Zahorik, J. A.; & Burbaker, D. L. Toward More Humanistic Instruction. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1972.